

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Claude Burgess,

PLAINTIFF

v.

Carolyn W. Colvin, Acting Commissioner of
Social Security,

DEFENDANT

Case No. 4:13-cv-00137-TLW

Order

This social security matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) filed on August 12, 2014 by Magistrate Judge Rogers, to whom this case was assigned. (Doc. #24.) In the R&R, the Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner’s decision denying Plaintiff’s claims for disability insurance benefits. Objections to the R&R were due August 29, 2014. Plaintiff did not file any objections. This matter is now ripe for decision.

The Court is charged with conducting a *de novo* review of any portion of the R&R to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that R&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636. However, in the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 200 (4th Cir. 1983). In such a case, “a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Furthermore, a party’s failure to file specific written objections to the R&R

waives the right to appellate review of that claim. *See id.*

The Court has carefully reviewed the R&R. Having found no clear error on the face of the record, the R&R is **ACCEPTED** and the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
Terry L. Wooten
Chief United States District Judge

September 9, 2014
Columbia, South Carolina